UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/619,179	07/19/2000	Dimitri Kanevsky	YO999-468	1031

7590	11/29/2005	EXAMINER

Paul D Greeley Esq
Ohlandt Greeley Ruggiero & Perle LLP
One Landmark Square 9th floor
Stamford, CT 06901-2682

EXAMINER
CHUONG, TRUC T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2179	

DATE MAILED: 11/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>01 September 2005</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>44-47,49,51-53 and 63-71</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>44-47,49,51-53 and 63-71</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This communication is responsive to an Amendment, filed 09/01/05.

Claims 44-47, 49, 51-53, and 63-71 are pending in this application. Claims 44, 63, and 71

are independent claims. In the communication, claims 44, 63 and 71 are amended. This rejection

is made final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

2.   Claims 44-47, 51-53, and 63-71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Odam et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,825,360) in view of Sumita et al. (U.S. Patent

No. 5,907,836).

As to claim 44, Odam teaches a method for automatic control of window overlap

comprising:

automatically determining priorities of each window of a plurality of overlapping

windows displayed on a graphical user interface (overlapping windows are defined by the

predetermine criteria, the window having the highest priority being positioned in the visual

foreground of the workspace, e.g., col. 3 lines 10-30, col. 6 lines 16-22, and figs. 3, 9-12), and

automatically arranging said plurality of windows to overlap one another in order of said priority

on said graphical user interface (e.g., col. 3 lines 10-30, col. 6 lines 16-22, col. 7 lines 1-11, and

figs. 3, 9-12). Although, Odam teaches that a logical overlap which means there is a critical area

of each window that the user <u>does not want to be obstructed</u>, it could be an ID, name, title, topic,

etc. of the displayed window (col. 16 lines 11-19). Odam still does not clearly show wherein said

window priority is derived from a topic of each window of said plurality of windows. Sumita

teaches that topics with higher priority is retrieved or sized differently regardless the

abstract/content or the length of the topic (Sumita, e.g., col. 4 lines 34-40, col. 40 lines 52-67,

figs. 69 and 72). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention to modify the priority windows of Odam based on the priority of the topic of

Sumiat to ease the viewer when visualizing and tracking the objects because there is a critical

area of each window that the user <u>does not want to be obstructed </u>(Odam, col. 16 lines 11-19).

As to dependent claim 45, Odam teaches the method further comprising:

automatically sizing said windows on said graphical user interface according to said

priority (e.g., col. 3 lines 10-30, col. 6 lines 16-22, and figs. 3, 9-12).

As to dependent claim 46, Odam teaches the method further comprising:

automatically positioning said windows on said graphical user interface according to said

priority (e.g., col. 3 lines 10-30, col. 6 lines 16-22, and figs. 3, 9-12).

As to dependent claim 47, Odam teaches the method wherein said windows are

automatically re-arranged only when a redrawing function is selected by a user (redraw function,

e.g., col. 8 lines 20-41).

As to dependent claim 51, Odam in view of Sumita teaches the method wherein the

contents of said window is determined by a content label assigned by a user (e.g., col. 7 lines 1-

10).

As to dependent claims 52-53, Odam in view of Sumita teaches the method further comprising:

automatically re-arranging windows so that said windows overlap one another in order of said priority on said graphical user interface (see claim 44 above); although, the modified Odam does not clearly teach re-arranging icons so that icons overlap one another in said task bar on the GUI, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the similar technique as applied to the windows with priority that has clearly mentioned in the priority windows of modified Odam above for easily to keep track of the concurrency between the displayed windows and the related icons on the taskbar.

As to claim 63, Odam in view of Sumita teaches the method of automatic control of window overlap based on a user's history of window user, comprising:

automatically determining a priority of each window of a plurality of overlapping windows displayed on a graphical user interface (overlapping windows are defined by the predetermine criteria, the window having the highest priority being positioned in the visual foreground of the workspace, e.g., col. 3 lines 10-30, col. 6 lines 16-22, and figs. 3, 9-12), wherein said priority is derived from an amount of scrolling performed on a window (Odam in view of Sumita does not clearly teach this feature; however, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the similar technique the performance/scrolling/browsing against the application/window to determine the priority of that application/window as applied to the windows with priority that has clearly mentioned in the priority windows of Odam in view of Sumita above for bring the most working/using window upfront to ease the user when working with the multiple opened windows; and

automatically arranging said plurality of windows to overlap one another in order of said priority on said graphical user interface (e.g., col. 3 lines 10-30, col. 6 lines 16-22, col. 7 lines 1-11, and figs. 3, 9-12).

As to dependent claim 64, Odam teaches storing one or more of said criteria (the current overlap value stored in variable MaxOverlap, e.g., col. 12 lines 14-17, and each priority number are stored in the memory of the system of Odam).

As to dependent claims 65-67, they are the equivalent claims 45-47 respectively and are rejected under a similar rationale.

As to dependent claim 68, it is the equivalent claim 49 and rejected under a similar rationale.

As to dependent claims 69-70, they are the equivalent claims 52-53 respectively and are rejected under a similar rationale.

As to claim 71, Odam teaches a method for automatic control of window overlap, comprising:

automatically determining priorities of each window of a plurality of overlapping windows displayed on a graphical user interface (e.g., col. 3 lines 10-30, col. 6 lines 16-22, and figs. 3, 9-12); and

automatically arranging said plurality of windows to overlap one another in order of said priority on said graphical user interface, wherein said window priority is derived from a topic of each window of said plurality of windows (note the rejection and the motivation to combine Odam and Sumita of claim 44 above),

wherein said topic of each window is determined by at least one keyword (Sumita, a set

of keywords of frequency occurrence in the topic of interest, the keywords being given a priority

order or weighted or by a retrieval equation for use in a usual document retrieval operation, e.g.,

col. 16 lines 23-30, and fig. 67), and

wherein said priority is determined by scanning said window for said at least one

keyword (Sumita, e.g., col. 16 lines 23-30, and fig. 67).

3.   Claim 49 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Odam et al. (U.S.

Patent No. 5,825,360) in view of Sumita et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,907,836), and further in view

of Bass et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,559,533).

As to dependent claim 49, Odam in view of Sumita teaches the method further

comprising:

automatically displaying for said window according to said priority on said graphical user

interface (see claim 44 above); however, the modified Odam still does not teach displaying

window in a color according the priority. Bass clearly teaches windows with colors (e.g., col. 11

lines 41-62, and fig. 6). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention to modify the priority windows of modified Odam in different colors as the

displayed windows of Bass to ease the viewer when visualizing the objects on the screen.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to previous office action have been considered but are

moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

4.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

Torres et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,897,635) teach priority, overlapping windows, and

a profile for displaying information (cols. 3-14 and figs. 3-9).

Dauerer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,841,435) teach overlapping windows, priority,

grouping criteria, and sizing (cols. 2-10 and figs. 1-17).

5.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Truc T. Chuong whose telephone number is 571-272-4134. The

examiner can normally be reached on M-Th and alternate Fridays 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on (571) 272-4847. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Truc T. Chuong

11/22/05

WEILUN LO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER